Ham-Policy Digest   Sat, 9 Jul 94   Volume 94 : Issue 302

Today's Topics:
                        CW - THE ONLY MODE!
                             subscribe

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 08 Jul 94 15:06:18 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!news.duke.edu!
solaris.cc.vt.edu!spcuna!starcomm.overleaf.com!n2ayj!n2ayj@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW - THE ONLY MODE!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2vg9fh$a31@nic.scruz.net> bill@cruz.com writes:
>(I also think there is a value to being able> to
>take written copy well, too.)

Like when you have to handle traffic?

--
Stan Olochwoszcz, N2AYJ - n2ayj@n2ayj.overleaf.com
"Please keep your seat belt securely fastened, keep hands and feet inside the
car at all times, secure loose items, exit to your right, and enjoy your day at
SixFlagsDisneyKing's GreatMagicDominionIsland BerryFarmGardensParkWorldLand."

Date: 9 Jul 94 11:57:20 GMT

Date: Fri, 8 Jul 1994 23:28:21 GMT
From: world!drt@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <070894055422Rnf0.79b4@dreamland.com>, <CsMDwn.I04@world.std.com>,
<2vjigk$1a8@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>
Subject : Re: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

Michael P. Deignan (md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu) wrote:
: In article <CsMDwn.I04@world.std.com>,
:   drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

: |> I'm still having trouble. Say the repeater is quiet. Someone
: |> attempts a reverse patch. As a direct consequence, an amateur
: |> transmitter is keyed and begins radiating a signal, and there is no
: |> guarantee that the person keying the transmitter is even licensed.

: The person making the reverse patch phone call isn't keying the transmitter.

How'ja figure?

: The automatic control operator is monitoring the status of voltage on
: a circuit, and detects a variation in that voltage. The automatic
: control operator has instructions that when this type of voltage
: fluctuation occurs that it should transmit a fluttering tone over
: the repeater output.

Huh? The same thing could be said for the TR switch in your
transceiver. That doesn't mean you're not keying it by pressing the
mic button. "It wasn't me who transmitted, it was my voltage-sensing
circuitry!" Nonsense.

If someone calls the reverse autopatch, it results in RF being
generated on an amateur band which is not under the control of any
licensed control operator. That's illegal. End of story.

: My paragraph above could apply to a reverse autopatch, or an alarm
: circuit monitoring the status of the repeater cabinent's doors. Or,
: for that matter, the time of day, or temperature outside.

Take care that your repeater doesn't become a beacon. Anyway, that
stuff is all under the trustee's control. Reverse patches, by
assumption in this case, are not under any licensee's control.

: It is quite impossible for someone making a reverse patch to "key"
: the transmitter. The automatic control operator must determine that
: the phone is ringing (that voltage fluctuation I spoke of.)

If the reverse patch doesn't key a transmitter, why does anyone care
about them? But they do, in fact, cause transmitters to transmit,
just as much as our transmitting on the input does so.

BTW, as explained elsewhere, machinery cannot be a control operator.
(What's your machinery's callsign??) Repeaters always have control
operators. Those without any licensed control operator must not
transmit, ever.*

The only trick to *automatic* control is that the Control Operator,
who must be a live, licensed human being, need not be present at the
control point. (Read that again before replying.) That doesn't mean
he doesn't exist - in fact, his license is still on the line for the
repeater's operation, and his call is usually given automatically, in
morse or recorded voice, at least every 10 minutes and at the end of
every communication, so it's easy to tell who it is.

* save for emergencies, of course

-drt

|David R. Tucker   KG2S   8P9CL   drt@world.std.com|

Date: Fri, 8 Jul 1994 23:40:59 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!
yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!world!drt@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2vfbab$omv@agate.berkeley.edu>, <Ri0TZ7r.edellers@delphi.com>,
<2vke9n$1ka@ccnet.ccnet.com>
Subject : Re: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

Bob Wilkins n6fri (rwilkins@ccnet.com) wrote:
: Michael P. Deignan (md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu) wrote:

: : It is quite impossible for someone making a reverse patch to "key"
: : the transmitter. The automatic control operator must determine that
: : the phone is ringing (that voltage fluctuation I spoke of.)

: Many automatic repeater controllers allow the caller to key the
: transmitter. Most controllers will signal out on the repeater that a
: caller is present on the phone line. Some controllers have a paging
: sequence of tones or voice that can indicate for whom the call is
: intended.

: Are all telephone users including amateurs concidered as third parties
: when making a reverce autopatch?

Yes, exactly! Same for a forward autopatch, *if* they're not
controlling a transmitter.

If you're talking on an amateur frequency, and you're not controlling
a transmitter, you are by default a third party.

-drt

|David R. Tucker   KG2S   8P9CL   drt@world.std.com|

Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:
: drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

: >Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:
: >: Gary has argued, and I BELIEVE you agreed, that there is no such thing as
: >: an Automatic Control Operator. But, that a station is under Automatic
: >: Control. That is, being operated WITHOUT a control operator being present
: >: directly at the control point (i.e. running automatically), such as a
: >: repeater during a 'user' patch, this arguably is NOT transmitting 'third
: >: party traffic' as defined by Part 97. Thus 97.109 (e) does not apply, as
: >: no 'third party traffic' is involved in the 'patch'.
: >
: >Well, every station needs a control operator (97.7). Under automatic

: >control, however, the control op need not be present at the control
: >point (97.109d).
: >
: >I still don't understand how a user patch is not third party traffic.
: >There are still three parties - control op input, control op repeater
: >(present at control point or not), and the other guy who is not
: >controlling any transmitter, who is the "third party" (the "Part 97
: >definition" - 97.3(42)). If there's someone present at the repeater
: >control point, everything's fine. If the fellow calling is actually a
: >control operator on a control link, this seems fine, too (if he's
: >licensed). If the repeater is under automatic control, then the
: >operation isn't legal. 97.109e again. It still doesn't seem arguable
: >otherwise.

: If there is no control operator, at or for the repeater, then there is no
: thrid party traffic involved in the patch. Check the definition of 'Third
: Party Traffic'.

Oh, Dan, you missed the key line, even though you quoted it! :

: >Well, every station needs a control operator (97.7). Under automatic
: >control, however, the control op need not be present at the control
: >point (97.109d).

EVERY STATION MUST HAVE A CONTROL OPERATOR. PERIOD. A station under
automatic control need not have the control operator *actually at the
control point*, but it MUST have a control operator. He's the
licensee, usually, and the repeater IDs with his call or the call he
holds in trust.

: Since there is no control operator at a control point (of the repeater),
: as it is under automatic control, an autopatch is "second party traffic"
: and not 'third party traffic' as defined in part 97.

Since the repeater station has a control operator at all times, there
are indeed 3 parties involved. Even if one of them is literally
asleep. The point of 97.109e is to require him (or someone!) to be
awake and at a control point, using local or remote control and not
automatic control, while his station is engaged in 3d party traffic.

: However, it would apprear that 'traffic' nets, conveying third party
: communications can not be done over a repeater under automatic control. I
: think that the NTS guys would be upset to hear about that. Perhaps the
: ARRL guys could get the FCC to clairify or exempt voice repeaters from
: these restrictions.

The only problem with that is that in this case the repeater is merely
retransmitting amateur signals, not handling third party traffic

itself. It's a bit of a fine point, but it is consistent. The ops on
the input are doing the traffic handling, and can be held responsible
for breaking the rules. (Which of them is not controlling a
transmitter?) During an autopatch, the *repeater* station, being the
one connected to the telephone lines and hence handling the 3d party
traffic itself, must have someone responsible at a control point to
ensure that the station is operating legally. If one user patched
another user into the telephone lines at his own station, rather than
using the repeater's patch, I don't think a repeater control operator
would be needed at a control point. There's already someone
controlling the interconnection.

: Part 97.109 is an interesting rule and I have some real problems with the
: way it is worded. I will have to see if I can find a copy of the NPRM or
: other documentation as to the WHY it was enacted.

I understand how you feel!

Date: Sat, 9 Jul 1994 00:03:26 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <373@ted.win.net>, <070694023257Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <374@ted.win.net>
Subject : Re: CW ... My view.

In article <070694023257Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com)
writes:
>
>The question is not what projects are hams copying from old QST's. The

Dan, I thought I put this to rest. To build a project from a book or
magazine is far from `copying'. It's rare that one can find the parts
called for so computatins for substitutions have to be made, coil forms
have to be found, coils wound, some parts need to be fabricated, many
will improve the design as they are building, or at least change it
to suit their needs, and so on...

Please don't become a mouthpiece for Gary - he originally used that
word `copying' and I've already proved it was the wrong choice of
word. On the other hand, we are amateurs, not professionals, so
don't chastise us for not designing our projects from scratch.

Jeff NH6IL

Date: Sat, 9 Jul 1994 00:31:29 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <pkwyZNj.edellers@delphi.com>, <CsMLt8.C0M@wang.com>,
<070894161451Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>¸É
Subject : Re: Emergency TX on police freq.

>dbushong@wang.com (Dave Bushong) writes:
>
>>But the FCC has already answered that question for us, when
>>it says:
>>
>>   \(sc 97.403 Safety of life and protection of property.
>>   No provision of these rules prevents the use by an amateur
>>station of any means of radiocommunication at its disposal to
>>provide essential communication needs in connection with the
>>immediate safety of human life and immediate protection of
>>property when normal communication systems are not available.
              ^^^

              I wonder if one could be held accountable to this
              later on? An investigation by the FCC or the local
              authorities might show that a cellular telephone
              site was in your locale and they might ask: ``Why
              were you in posession of a radio capable of transmit-
              ing on public safety frequencies rather than a
              cell phone? After all, the cell system was available.''
                                       ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

        Jeff NH6IL

Date: Sat, 9 Jul 1994 00:56:10 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CsMLt8.C0M@wang.com>, <070894161451Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<CsnDGH.BIp@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Subject : Re: Emergency TX on police freq.

In my last article the underlined portion should be:

``... system was available.''
     ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
to emphasize that the system was there (even though you might not

have had a cell phone).

Jeff NH6IL

Date: Fri, 08 Jul 1994 07:28:16 -0500
From: ncar!asuvax!pitstop.mcd.mot.com!mcdphx!schbbs!mothost!lmpsbbs!NewsWatcher!
user@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2v1pgt$3kt@news.iastate.edu>, <2vh9et$mdb@vortex.eng.sc.rolm.com>,
<2vhki4$h1n@agate.berkeley.edu>¸æ
Subject : Re: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

In article <2vhki4$h1n@agate.berkeley.edu>,
kennish@kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU (Ken A. Nishimura) wrote:

> In article <2vh9et$mdb@vortex.eng.sc.rolm.com>,
>
> (Observations on repeaters deleted.)
>
> >Personally, I don't think it is legal for a non-ham to initiate a
> >reverse patch call, unless it's an emergency.
> >
>
> Exactly. In fact, I'm willing to say that reverse-patches are illegal
> period. Why? When used in reverse mode, you are not using the
> repeater as a repeater (i.e. not taking an RF signal on input and
> retransmitting it), nor can you say that it is an ancillary function,
> since it is not accessed via the input frequency of the repeater.
> So, the automatic control exemptions do not apply.
>
> Thus, where is the control operator? Clearly a non-ham can't be a control
> op. If the person on the phone is a ham, where is the control point?
> Can the person on the phone turn the transmitter on and off?
> Maybe, maybe not. If not, then the person on the phone isn't
> at the control point.
>
> By using the repeater station in a non-repeater fashion (i.e. not
> retransmissing an signal on input or performing a function
> directly connected with that function, say a clean-up ID),
> the "repeater" just becomes another amateur station, and
> is subject to the control op/point requirements.
>
> Granted, this is all a very gray area, but if one reads the
> rules carefully, I would side with the opinion that reverse
> patches are illegal.

```
>
> Now that the net-lawyers are awake, how about repeaters that
> automagically transmit the time out of the blue?  How about
> the fact that 99% of all cross-band repeat operations are illegal?
>
>                              -Ken

That's the same point I tried to make a few argumentative threads ago when
we were trying to decide when a coordinated repeater had interference
protection from a non-coordinated one.  You have correctly identified the
situation: A repeater can cause interference ONLY when in a self-initiating
mode. Otherwise the interference is caused by the "dolt" on the input who
can hear another station on the output but still squeezes the switch and
"talks over" the communications in progress.

Cross-band repeaters aren't illegal per se, but they sure don't utilize any
form of spectral efficiency which USED to be considered good amateur
operating practice.  However, the USERS who don't listen to the outputs of
BOTH (or ALL) the linked stations running in repeater mode are absolutely
responsible for the interference they cause to others already using the
various frequencies involved.

--
Karl Beckman, P.E.              <The difference between stupidity and >
Motorola Comm - Fixed Data      <genius is that genius has its limits.>

Amateur radio WA8NVW @ K8MR.NEOH.USA.NA        NavyMARS VBH @ NOGBN.NOASI
The statements and opinions expressed here are not those of Motorola Inc.

------------------------------

Date: Sat, 09 Jul 1994 03:13:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!
amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <070694023257Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <374@ted.win.net>,
<CsnC5q.B3K@news.Hawaii.Edu>dan
Subject : Re: CW ... My view.

jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>In article <070694023257Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com)
writes:
>>
>>The question is not what projects are hams copying from old QST's. The
>
>Dan, I thought I put this to rest. To build a project from a book or
```

>magazine is far from `copying'. It's rare that one can find the parts
>called for so computatins for substitutions have to be made, coil forms
>have to be found, coils wound, some parts need to be fabricated, many
>will improve the design as they are building, or at least change it
>to suit their needs, and so on...
>
>Please don't become a mouthpiece for Gary - he originally used that
>word `copying' and I've already proved it was the wrong choice of
>word. On the other hand, we are amateurs, not professionals, so
>don't chastise us for not designing our projects from scratch.

Jeff I never said that there was anything wrong with 'copying' things from
old QST's, just that that was not the hight of 'Advancing the radio art'.
Nor is that the onlyh place to start experimenting. ARS should be big
enough to start WHERE EVER you choose and is approiate for YOU. We ALL
should not have to repeat what has come before. Some can start a bit 'up
the ladder' others, like me, need to start a bit lower down (like the
first rung!).

My arguement is that there are more things in the world and more places to
START than 40 year old projects rerun for 1928, in QST.

Dan
--
"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price
of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what
course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME
DEATH!"   -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775
=+=+=> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

----

Date: Fri, 08 Jul 1994 16:21:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!
wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2vf1k8$bkt@ccnet.ccnet.com>, <070894024301Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<CsMEIs.KD4@world.std.com>
Subject : Re: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

>Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:
>: Gary has argued, and I BELIEVE you agreed, that there is no such thing as
>: an Automatic Control Operator. But, that a station is under Automatic
>: Control. That is, being operated WITHOUT a control operator being present
>: directly at the control point (i.e. running automatically), such as a

```
>: repeater during a 'user' patch, this arguably is NOT transmitting 'third
>: party traffic' as defined by Part 97. Thus 97.109 (e) does not apply, as
>: no 'third party traffic' is involved in the 'patch'.
>
>Well, every station needs a control operator (97.7).  Under automatic
>control, however, the control op need not be present at the control
>point (97.109d).
>
>I still don't understand how a user patch is not third party traffic.
>There are still three parties - control op input, control op repeater
>(present at control point or not), and the other guy who is not
>controlling any transmitter, who is the "third party" (the "Part 97
>definition" - 97.3(42)).  If there's someone present at the repeater
>control point, everything's fine.  If the fellow calling is actually a
>control operator on a control link, this seems fine, too (if he's
>licensed).  If the repeater is under automatic control, then the
>operation isn't legal.  97.109e again.  It still doesn't seem arguable
>otherwise.
```

If there is no control operator, at or for the repeater, then there is no
thrid party traffic involved in the patch. Check the definition of 'Third
Party Traffic'.

Since there is no control operator at a control point (of the repeater),
as it is under automatic control, an autopatch is "second party traffic"
and not 'third party traffic' as defined in part 97.

Please compare this to the current rules as my copy is a couple years old,
I need a new one, Part 97 defines;

97.3 (a)

(39) *Third party communications*. A message from the control operator
(first party) of an amateur station to another amateur station control
operator (second party) on behalf of another person (third party).

{Emphs. is the FCC's NOT mine!}

An autopatch, reverse or otherwise does NOT meet this criteria. There
fore, IMHO without futher evidence, Part 97.109 (e) may not apply to an
autopatch.

However, it would apprear that 'traffic' nets, conveying third party
communications can not be done over a repeater under automatic control. I
think that the NTS guys would be upset to hear about that. Perhaps the
ARRL guys could get the FCC to clairify or exempt voice repeaters from
these restrictions.

Part 97.109 is an interesting rule and I have some real problems with the
way it is worded. I will have to see if I can find a copy of the NPRM or
other documentation as to the WHY it was enacted.

Dan
--
"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price
of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what
course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME
DEATH!"   -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775
=+=+=> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #302
****